



PUDDLE to PARADISE

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS
OF MODERNISM



PUDDLE TO PARADISE

By B. H. Shadduck, Ph. D.



Copyright 1925 by B. H. Shadduck

JUST TO GET OUR BEARINGS

Many excuse me on the grounds of ignorance.

If you will read with this impression, you will think for yourself instead of nursing theories left on your doorstep while you were overawed with scholarship.

No doctrine worth while is beyond the reach of the world's burden bearers—the common people. Only error needs to hide in a fog of words. My effort will be to translate the hocus-pocus of evolution into simple words, believing that the contradictions of this "science," if held up to the light, will not make much of a bluff.

In speaking of the Bible, I mean the Holy Scriptures accepted by Christ and the Apostolic Church.

If these pages are read by any POLITE person who has been unfortunate in the choice of ancestors, I regret that I must discuss the family's unhappy past. I would do anything to help you forget it.

I use the words "evoluter" and "evolution-ism" because they fit the man and the propaganda of the man who musses up his own ancestry with beast that crawl and bark and gibber and then, to avoid shame, slanders the parentage of everyone else.

I FIGHT NOT ONE EVOLUTION, BUT TWO.

Evolution means survival by claw and fang and ambush and treachery. They have fixed up another goody-goody kind for the Sunday School. If they believe the brute kind was good TO GET US HERE, LET THEM PRACTICE WHAT THEY PREACH! EVOLUTION HAS NOT ONE LAW FOR FOUR LEGS AND ANOTHER FOR TWO.

The evoluter asks us to keep "hands-off" his religion, while he destroys ours. Under the mask of "science," he vilifies our origin and mocks our faith in a miracle working God at the taxpayers' expense. He is willing to wink at some sort of hope-so heaven if we accept his frog-pond Eden.

If some wish to apologize for the Bible and adjust their faith to this loose-leaf creed, we do not want our children adjusted at our expense.

They are passing around a little phrase that is reckoned a withering retort. "I would as soon be made of an ape as a ball of mud." I sometimes wonder if they expect God himself to know what they mean if they don't know themselves. If they mean that God took the lime, carbon, water, etc., in an ape and made a man as a mill makes near silk of sawlogs, that is not evolution. It does not remotely approximate evolution. Evolution means that man was BORN of an ape and that there was no appreciable difference between the highest ape and the lowest man. They tell us that we yet retain some "hold-over" from every crawling worm or reptile our ancestors have ever been. All right, lets go.



IF EVOLUTION WORKED

Right now, I ought to have feathers on my arms.

Pin feathers, anyhow.

As a boy, I longed for wings—soaring wings, flapping wings, bat-like wings, any kind of wings that would afford deliverance from plodding journeys.

According to the constitution and by-laws of evolution, I ought to have wings.

Do I talk like a fool?

No. I talk like a man who really thinks evolution will work right here and now—if there is one such.

One of the suppositions that go with the theory of evolution is that there was a time when the reptiles could not get where they were going, fast enough. (I have been in that fix myself.) Now another supposition is that when eyes were needed, "eyes came out to meet the need" and when ears were needed, they came out to hear. The reptiles needed wings: they needed them then and there, but when you want evolution to do anything, you must place your order a million years ahead. Evolution can't be hurried because that would be a miracle too miraculous. It seem that evolution looked the field over and selected a pair of reptiles with a long scale or hair or flap of skin on their legs and **mated them up.** (!) From the progeny, it chose a pair a wee bit more-so and **let them "survive."** Always selecting with wings in mind, its "survivors" became pretty birds and because it helped them survive, **they layed speckled eggs.**

If the Bible contained such folly, how evoluters would mock.

The snakes that could not get feathers started did not die; **they ate birds.** Evolution often feeds its "survivors" to those that have been **THEORETICALLY** survived. I have been survived a great many times in the same way, because I did not have wings.

You don't understand how a reptile could grow feathers?

It isn't supposed to be understood. It has been spread out over such vast periods of time and the mystery has been so thinned out with gradual changes that it is supposed to soak through the cracks of your mind without being understood.

And yet, a feather is such a delicate, complicated, wonderful structure that one wonders how a feather machine could make itself, set itself up in the right place and push feathers out in exactly the right way. You see, if it got them wrong end to or wrong side out or didn't lap them just right, they would be only trouble makers. **You wonder just what a feather was ten years before it was a feather.**

I don't know; ask the professor.

What I want to know is, what we have to do to get wings! Probably every normal minded barefooted boy since Cain and Abel has hurt his feet with stone and briars, has wanted wings. Man has from the first been devising ways to get somewhere without walking. He has longed for wings, so much that wings are in his poetry and associated with his heaven. Along with the want-to, there has been dire need. Millions have lost their lives in times of danger, for want of wings. Surely we have met all the conditions. An eminent authority (McCook) says a "17 year locust" (Cicada) grows wings from "buds" in 15 minutes. How do we proceed to get "buds"?

Evolute is an imaginary verb in the past tense. The farther back in the past you assume its magic, the more the mystery fades and the more "scientific" it becomes. Imagine a professor saying to his class, "This frog is beginning to get ready to develop wings," or "This toad has started to commence to develop a marsupial pouch," or "I see in this turtle a drift that indicates turtles will some day nurse their young."

Some theories must not be pushed too far.

And yet, evolution is a very convincing theory if you wish to believe it an need it as a poultice for sin. Jesus said false prophets would arise with an amazing show of seeming proof. (Matt. 24:24). Did he mean evoluters? Well, it is **certain he did not mean people who believe the Bible TOO MUCH.** His warning ought to make his people cautious. There is always a contradiction in false doctrine.

THE TALE OF A PAIL

My neighbor tells a pig story in four chapters.

(1) He bought a half starved runt of a pig. (2) He fed it a bucket of slop and it squealed for more. (3) He fed it a second bucket of slop and it asked for more. (4) He put the pig

in the bucket and the bucket was not nearly full.

I can believe either end of the story by itself.

My neighbor seems to believe all of it because when he tells one part he isn't thinking of the other parts.

It is easy to give mental assent to conflicting ideas, if you keep them so far apart that they do not bump each other. All I ask of students of evolution is to bring its contrary theories into focus at the same time.

There are some sincere souls who think they believe in the Bible and evolution and the more they believe in one, the less they believe in the other. Others think they have effected a working compromise, but the compromise is usually all on one side. I want no harmony that will back the Bible in on a switch to let the circus train go by. I want to bring on a head end collision—in your minds at least. I am not unmindful of those students who would like to believe the Bible, but have had evolutionism dinned into them till their minds follow the beaten path. If such students will try to undo the dinning long enough to consider all that is **missing, misapplied or contradictory** in the testimony, I have no fears for Bible. If you have reached the place where you look for contradictions in the Bible and connected truth in evolutions, isn't it time to reverse the process in the interest of fair play?

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

It is obvious that the only possible evidence of what happened when man appeared on earth must be circumstantial, **unless the only eye witness is permitted to testify**. If what purports to be God's testimony is received, it is against evolution.

I am well aware that many attempts have been made to turn this testimony into "allegory" and make it fit evolution, but allegory must not be made to mean exactly the opposite of what it says. Here is a summary of the testimony and the "allegory."

THE BIBLE

God formed man of the dust.

God breathed into his nostrils and he became a living soul.

This was to fulfill the plan to make man in God's image.

In the catalog of animals, there was not one fit to be his mate.

Adam was put into deep sleep and a mate made from a rib.

They were warned not to do a certain thing.

A reinterpreter appeared and persuaded Eve that God did not

mean exactly what he said and promised an evolution to something better.

Man fell and the curses followed.

THE "ALLEGORY"

God made man by proxy; an ape mammy furnished the "dust." He took a breath for himself when he was born, like other apes. He was not made in God's image; just started to evolve in that direction.

His mate was another ape product; the ape acting for God, of course.

Man fell slowly, painfully UP.

The other details are "folk lore."

Why this labored effort?

Evidently to thin out the miracle of creation so that anti-miracle "christians" with weak stomachs can take a little broth. To borrow a phrase from electricians, unbelievers want their miracles "stepped down" to a very low voltage. When you begin making allegories out of miracles, there is no logical stopping place till you make an allegory of God. If we knew the details of Adams's physical makeup before the fall and knew that he had neighbors made on much the same physical pattern, was there anyone to forbid God making him just that way as a special creative act?



Let us illustrate with another miracle. Exodus 4 records the story of a stick that God turned into a snake. Can you say with certainty on which you would risk your soul, "God couldn't do it; if it was like a snake, it was born of a snake that evolved from a fish"?

Is the New Testament allegory also? Matt. 3:9 says, "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." If God did just that thing they might resemble men without having any evolutionary connection with man or monkey. If creation is impossible in Genesis, it is impossible in Matthew.

Surely there cannot be any possible evidence that a God who did make a serpent from a stick and could make a man from a stone, could not have made his image man immediately and like anything else he pleased.

Evolution-ism, when you simmer it down, puts ape limitations on man and human limitations on God. They assume that

GOLIATH LAUGHS AT A "FOE"

HE HAS OUTGROWN THE WRAPPINGS OF THE PROPHETS

AT A "FOE" WHO THINKS



we are only a pint of brains ahead of an ape, and as for God—he must have been limited to what man's brain approves.

Some will concede that **God could do it**, but they shrink from **overworking** him. Some will say, "Must we believe the improbable?"

Is creation improbable?

If it is, **evolution is impossible**. How else could there be the first life for evolution to start with?

To say that it started itself, is disastrous, for there would be **no one to stop it, if there was no one to start it**. It is just as necessary to the theory of evolution to stop the process that would produce the first life as to start it. If it could start one place at one time, it could start in many places, many times. If you leave the gate open like that, 30 minutes of time and a ten-acre swamp would generate enough "ancestors" to give each form of life a little forefather of its own.

Is that clear?

It is vital to the theory of **one ancestor for all**, to presume a some-how-or-other starter to start one little lone progenitor, and have another presumption to stop the starter **before it starts two**. Otherwise there might be a different origin for each kind of creature, and that would be **CREATION thinned out by a process**. That would permit each kind to be brought forth "after their kind." This could not explain the creation of Adam, but it would ruin the theory of evolution utterly.

DONATIONS

No man has ever been able to string together the guesses of evolutionism and make a theory, without donating the string. It requires mental contributions to fill up the gaps. When the first life appeared, it **could have nothing by inheritance**. It was an **ORPHAN** before it happened. It was blind, deaf, brainless and invisible; if it had any internal "laws" or instinct, you must donate them. You must donate the presumption that some presiding **substitute-for-a-miracle**, gave it a chemical laboratory, factories and machines to transmit to others, to make feathers, hair, wool, bone, fins, fiddles and **all** the balance of equipment known to life. Everything that has ever come out of life must have been in it then or has been **donated since**. You must donate chance to get such freaks as the

fish that carries a light on the end of a pole. You must donate luck to prevent some one from evolving a destroyer that would put an end to all the others. Suppose some insect that forks havoc now, had grown as large as an elephant!

The controversy really hangs on the question, Could God make man just as the Book says he did? If you say, "No," it shows what this 'ism leads to. If you say "Yes, but I don't think he did," it is then a matter of theory and **theory is not science.**

ONLY THEORIES

For every theory of evolution, there is a theory of creation, just as reasonable, which would nullify it. I suggest a few, but remember they are only theories. I have no wish to inflict another supplement to the Bible, on a world already cursed with man-made revelation. **Faith is only a plaything** if it cannot outlast a California redwood, but must be rebuilt for every crop of toadstools.

(1) Many able expositors believe the second verse of the Bible describes the wreck of a world formerly inhabited. Continents may have blown up and gone down, leaving the sky black with smoke and gas. If this be true, ancient fossils have no value as evidence.

(2) There may have been man-like animals before Adam and during his life. Some creature called "nachash" in the Hebrew, "was more subtle than any beast of the field." It seems not to have surprised Eve that he could talk and claim to know as much about religion as God did. He convinced her that his plans were evolutionary and would evolve her to a "higher" state. If you think of him as a serpent, remember, the serpent shape was later.

(3) Genesis 6 records the story of cross breeding that corrupted the race. "The Nephilim were in the earth in those days and also after that . . ." There are three interpretations of this obscure passage, none of them wholly convincing, but it is clear that there was a mix-up that greatly displeased God. After the flood there was another appearance of Nephilim, recorded in Num. 13:33. If they ever find a skull of the Nephilim, how they will cavort.

(4) God remade the nachash, introduced thorns and this-

bles, marked Cain, reduced the age of man twice, gave beast heart and habits to Nebuchadnezzar, prepared a fish for Jonah, and there is nothing in the Bible to say he may not have made many other changes in animals and men. Since man has worshipped beast, sinned with beasts and thought like beasts, there may have been a "mark of the beast" long before the one spoken of in Revelation. Certainly we are not now as God made man.

(5) There is much that we do not know about prenatal markings called "birth marks." We do not know how much the mind may affect the body or what changes sin may have worked in past centuries.

(6) The Bible teaches that God has, at times, accommodated those who "did not like to retain God in their KNOWLEDGE." (Rom. 1:23, 28) The man who prefers brute ancestry ought to be humored enough to let him believe he has. I do not say that 2 Thes. 2:11 refers to such men, but I will say it cannot refer to eager believers in the words of him who said, "If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me. God may have had arrogant scholarship in mind when he made all creatures.

(7) According to the showing of evolution-ists, there are more forms "degenerate" among visible creatures, than there are forms maintaining their place. Then why not presume that bones that indicate half-way stages (if any do) are from degenerate creatures that have gone back rather than forward? This would fit the teachings of the Book.

Not only can we nullify evolutionary theories with other theories, but **their theories nullify themselves.**

THEORIES THAT KILL THEMSELVES

Someone has thought up a slogan, "Facts are Final," and the children of the "mud puppy" (or whatever it was) wonder why the children of the rib-woman do not surrender. The pity is that the student mistakes theories for facts. There are only three general facts, all of which, if not overworked or padded, are in accord with the Bible. Here they are:

- (a) Certain forms of life are similar to other forms.
- (b) Certain forms appeared before other forms.
- (c) Certain forms are not just what they were long ago.

We need not discuss these facts except as we discuss the

theories of how they came to be facts. I expect to show that evolutionary theories cannot explain the facts because its theories are contradictory.

DIRIGIBLE EVOLUTION

If facts are final, when did evolution-ism reach any finality?

A friend of mine who is an eminent college president has sent me a learned treatise to set me right. The important words in the title are the "TREND of Biology."

What a fitting name!

For the benefit of child readers, let me explain that "trend" means it is leaving the place where it is and going to some place where it isn't. Just like sheep in short pasture. Ever since I can remember, they have been trending.

THE LAW OF EVOLUTIONARY LAWYERS

There are certain laws of life, well known to stock breeders, that the prophets of the bog, by fog or pettifog, harness to their 'ism. Put in simple language, these are VARIATION, HEREDITY, ADJUSTMENT, SELECTION.

VARIATION

Variation is the law that no two, born of the same parents are alike. Adam must have known that, but how can it unroll, unwind or evolve a machine where there isn't one? The stockman takes advantage of variation, but he does what the law cannot do for itself. To develop a characteristic, he line-breeds the freaks to develop the freakishness. Arbitrary selection, segregation, and line-breeding will produce a herd of Holsteins on one side of a fence and Jerseys on the other. Never in a million years will Nature, left to itself to go haphazard, do that. Nature will do exactly the opposite and left to itself will breed to a common level. Nature resists the breeder and if the fence is broken down for two years it will upset the work of fifty years.

Questions for the class in arithmetic:

If nature, left to itself, will in two years upset the work of fifty years, how long will it take nature to do all the breeder can do and work a miracle that he wouldn't believe if he saw it? How long would it take to evolve a hog into something

else that does not look like a hog, taste like a hog, smell like a hog, act like a hog, give it an equipment that hogs do not need, and it cannot do without?

When the breeder has done his most and his best, cows are only cattle and hogs continue to be swine. He cannot turn them into camels or coyotes. Nature when it has done its most and its best (if left to itself) will make scrubs out of thoroughbred. All the breeder can do is to **MODIFY THE STRUCTURE THE ANIMAL ALREADY HAS**. The stockman can breed a white belt around a black hog but he cannot breed antlers onto its head. To grow a hair or a horn or a feather requires a machine in the body that can manufacture just that. Evolution undertakes to unwrap in a creature, what that form of life never had.

Man is having trouble with his teeth; will the "scientists" kindly tell us how we may unroll or evolve a gizzard?

Much is made of the fact that breeders can breed certain equipment off. That is not evolution, **it is the opposite**. One of the eminent "authorities" on evolution says there are 180 structures in the human body that we have lost the use of, wholly or in part, **because we ceased to use them**. They say all mammals are in much the same fix.

Please underscore that with red ink. We will need it later. **THAT CONFESSION OUGHT TO SINK THE SYSTEM FOREVER.**

Is evolution a process of subtraction?

Unless they can show that we have 180 structures getting ready to be used, **MAN IS HEADED THE WRONG WAY**. If losing the use of ourselves is evolution, then death must be a grand evolutionary spurt. One hundred and eighty disappearing structures are 180 arguments against evolution and 180 arguments that only the grace of God can keep man from the junk pile. "Except ye repent," ye shall lose all the rest of yourself.

Millions and millions of creatures, **ALL GOING, NONE COMING**. They do not tell of one organ that we are going to have. If they could find one tail feather on a frog, they would have one argument for evolution. Why don't they graft one on just to make a showing? They are already borrowing grafts from the monkeys to restore **OVER-**



EVOLVED men; here's hoping they graft brains next.

If an unused organ must recede, then the evolution of a new organ would be a-b-s-o-l-u-t-e-l-y impossible, because an organ can't be used before we get it and while we are getting it before it can be used, it **MUST RECEDE**.

They say that apes can wiggle their ears and most men cannot. This, they argue, is evidence that when men ceased to be apes, they began to lose that **CONVENIENCE** along with other advantages. If we could and the apes could not, **that would also prove evolution**. Whether the wiggle is coming or going, "**ALL IS GRIST THAT COMES TO THE EVOLUTER'S MILL**." Elephants can wiggle their noses more than we can; that proves we evolved from elephants.

RATCHET WHEEL HEREDITY

Heredity is the stubborn law of life that would fight evolution to the last ditch. Evolution-ism must have a docile heredity that will listen to reason. It can only use heredity that will **loosen up** long enough to get a change of equipment and then **tighten up** long enough to fix the change. It must be like a ratchet wheel: let evolution go forward and catch it when it tries to fly back. This made-to-order heredity has allowed our ancestors to lose four kinds of tails, but insists on fish gills in the unborn.

ADJUSTMENT, NOT INVENTION

God has planted in life an ability to adjust itself to changed conditions and environment, **within limits**. The Bible does not guarantee fixity of type such as the length of a bone or the color of a feather. It does guarantee a fixity of what it calls "kind" so that nature can never turn a turkey into a goose. Move a polecat to a cold climate and it will grow heavier fur and not take a geological age to do it. Move it to a rainy climate and it will not grow an umbrella in any period of time. Nature may modify what the creature has, but **cannot create an organ that it has not**. The boy who persists in smoking will find his body speedily adjusts itself to nicotine, so that nausea ceases, and it does not take glaciers, sinking continents and earthquakes to do it; but he will not grow a pipe or a smokestack while the world standeth.

One eminent writer explains that deer developed antlers

because for ages, the males pushed their heads together and made callous places that finally turned into horns.

If pressure will produce horns, why have they not developed on man's feet?

Why does the deer shed his antlers?

Why should he have more spikes on his antlers each year?

Why should horns grow in forks with one animal and spirals with another?

Isn't it about time for work horses to get the beginnings of horns on their shoulders.

If bruises produce horns, the turtle and porcupine must have had some activity like football.

Some exponents of the doctrine have abandoned this theory. In fact, there is no phase of evolution that someone has not abandoned.

Not only are creatures unable to develop what they have not got, but what they haven't got does not need to be developed. If a creature can get along without a marsupial pouch to carry its babies in (AND THEY DO), what is the distressing need that will evolve one? Whatever handicap the creatures have, they hold their own. The slow going toad catches insects enough, and that is all a swallow can do. Not being able to go South, the toad doesn't need to. The bat with its wings, has not crowded out the mouse that must go afoot.

"SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST"

The "survival of the fittest" has fooled millions. It is as convincing as a cast iron lion in the dark.

Here is a little question for the professor:

WHEN THE FITTEST SURVIVE AND THE LESS FIT OUTLIVE THEM, WHICH IS THE "SURVIVINGEST" SURVIVOR?

According to the program, the creature farthest back in the surviving process is the amoeba. It has been "survived" more than any other form of life on earth, (if this survival law is not foolishness) yet it keeps right on living though numberless "survivors" have become extinct. Its numbers are limited only by infinity.

The entire fabric of evolution depends on the false theory that what they call "higher" and "later" form of life, are better fitted to survive. It takes for granted a presumption that

life has evolved for hundreds of millions of years from amoeba to man because each "higher" form was better able to survive than the one beneath it.

What spoils this "bedtime story" is the fact that stubborn "lower" forms persist where the "higher" forms cannot. Is it the truth or a lie, that numberless billions of one celled creatures can be dried up, frozen up, buried in the mud or blown away and come right back and do business?

Ask any school boy who has studied biology.

Of course there is an element of truth in this survival theory. Old mammy toad will leave a thousand eggs in a pool. Averages indicate that only one can live to the second year. Now it is obvious that if one little tadpole can outwit all the foes and get all the food when there is only enough for one, he has quite the best chance to make his mother a grandma.

But, the spryest little fellow may be the one first within reach of a foe. The most cautious one may be the one that goes without its dinner. With death lurking on four sides, above and below, I will pick the average tadpole for the winner. If they were more helpless or stupid a million years ago, it is difficult to understand how any of them lived.

No doubt if black and white rabbits were turned loose to run wild, they would in time, breed back to a common color that was protective, and that is about all that "survival" can do for them. Some student will say, "Surely, the fastest rabbits will survive and raise the average of speed." This seems plausible until you consider that their natural foes use strategy and stealth as much as speed. Speed in a rabbit begets overconfidence and does damage when it makes short turns in the briers.

Now suppose this survival theory could add speed, size, and sagacity, that would not be evolution because the rabbit would still be a rabbit. If "survival" could give the rabbit an equipment like a skunk, that would be evolution for the rabbit, but it would be EVIL-ution for everything else. Imagine, if you can, how soon other life would be driven out. Now evolution has had millions of years (they say) and millions of chance to develop in some creature an equipment that would destroy competitors, but each form of life has enough equipment and not too much. It would take a board of scien-

tists a thousand years to figure out so nice a balance as we see in nature. Would evolution do that?

It is a vital part of the law of "survival" that no creature can develop an equipment that hinders it or helps its foes. Is that true professor?

If the so called "higher" forms of life are so handicapped in the struggle for food and mates and progeny and against fire, frost, famine, flood and foes that "lower" forms are not quickly driven out, then it argues that they were created that way. Never mind what some propagandist say about it; use your common sense. You can see that one bird lays but one egg, another 16. One animal is short on speed, another on wit, another on defense, another on the variety it can eat, another on progeny, so that a wonderful balance is preserved. (Job. 39:17).

I quite agree with evolutionism that water life appeared first. The Bible says so. We believe it pleased God to create life in the order he did. The evolutionist must begin as near nothing as possible so that it will minimize the miracle of getting the first life and not overwork the necessity of creation. Having presumed one invisible life, the next thing to presume is that through all the ages nature put a premium on the more complicated forms and gave a bonus of life and progeny to those that developed brain, speed, defense, etc.

That is exactly what evolution would do if evolution were a fact.

THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT HAS NOT BEEN DONE BECAUSE IT IS NOT A FACT.

Every advantage has some corresponding handicaps, disproving evolution.

On this proposition I am willing to stake the fight.

Let us begin at the beginning.

There is a greatly magnified picture of a little bag of soup that they say started the trouble. The first figure shows the little ancestor getting ready to have a puckering in its equator. Figure 2 shows the furniture divided and moved, half in each end. Figure 3 shows it broken in two without hurting it. How it could know when to move the furniture or how to move it or where to move it, when it has not brains or nerves, we do not know. Since there must be heredity, variation and survival to get evolution started, will the professor kindly advise

us which end gets the heredity and which end survived? Since each end is the other end of the other end, how are we to get variation started? Since the one that live now are presumed to be divisions of the first one and stubbornly refuse to evolve, it is difficult to see how any variation could help them.

Why should a creature that can multiply by division and add to its numbers by subtraction, adopt a sex complication that would double the hazard, slow up the process, start a fight among rivals and cumber the settlement with more or less helpless infancy?

Would sex help sexless creatures to resist calamity?

Suppose, just to be generous, we donate sex to evolution, (I do not know any other way it could get it) so that it can get heredity, variation and plenty of fights started.

Now why should a creature that can lay from a hundred to ten million eggs that will hatch themselves, forsake that prolific, care-free method and lay only a few eggs that must be kept warm?

After laying eggs for a hundred million years or so, why should any creature junk the equipment and install the more troublesome system of birth?

Why should creatures that could produce young that could take care of themselves, add to their troubles and help their foes by producing young that needed to be hovered, guarded, and fed?

Perhaps some clever theorist can juggle words and make you believe that the more helpless the young creatures are and the fewer they are, the more there will be of them.

Why should creatures that are equally at home in the water or on land, able to get food or seek safety in either place, limit themselves to the land? Is there any such creature now that could utterly forsake the water and flourish?

Why should creatures having cold blood, requiring comparatively little food, suffering no harm when they freeze solid, adopt hot blood, so they suffer from cold and need more food? Why should any creature work an injury to itself, if evolution is supervising the job?

There is only one answer to these questions. The Personal Creator who maintains a balance of life on earth, hangs handicaps on those creatures, that because of superior equipment in other ways, might banish other life.

I do not know what God's plan for the creatures was before "all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth"; (Gen. 6:12) (See Is. 11:7) I only remind you that life as it is, has a distribution of advantage, handicap, and hazard utterly foreign to any blind haphazard drift of evolution.

It must be apparent to all, that to prolong the period of helpless infancy is to multiply the hazard of death before maturity. If evolution has done that, it has made lies out of its own laws. They have tried to escape this by presuming that a prolonged helplessness in infancy insures a longer mature life but this is not true. The 17 year "locust" has 17 years' infancy and a few days of adult life. The turtle, goose, and many other creatures are helpless for only a brief period, yet they live to great age.

There is also a handicap in being "educated" past the place where you can believe God and see simple facts.

If an evoluter could visit Mars and find the order of life exactly opposite, so that life seemed to flow from the complex to the simple, he would come back and say, "They have evolution up there also."

DOUBLE-BARRELED EVOLUTION

If evolution is true, it is a combination like a tin can connected to a dog at the tail. Each end keeps the other busy.

It takes a sexless creature and develops in it a need for a mate at the same time it is developing a mate that needs to be needed.

How thoughtful! What rare foresight!

It takes a creature with cold blood, gives it hot blood so it can freeze to death and makes it a fur coat so it will not. It takes eggs that will hatch themselves and makes them need to be hovered and changes the mother's mind so she is obsessed with a desire to hover them. It takes swamp babies able to hustle for themselves and make them need warm milk at exactly the same time that it fixes up a mother that needs to be milked.

It is as wonderful as a blind paper hanger matching all the figures as he works, by the smell of the flowers on the paper; but you must believe it or be called ignorant. ➤

A WHALE OF A TALE OF A TAIL OF A WHALE

They say the whale was a fish many million years ago, with a

tail like other fish, and it could lay thousands of eggs in the sand and dismiss the matter. Most fish are content to stay in the water, but the fishy ancestors of the whale had evolution in them and took spells of wandering about on the land. Because it helped them survive, they lost their fish tail and got another kind. You see, changes of habits and shape helped them survive and surviving helped them to change their habits and shape.

Very convenient arrangement!

After a million years or so, these once-upon-a-time fish were not fish any more. They were Mytholizards or something just as needless. They ought to have been content with this, but they had evolution in them and in order to survive, they had to unroll again and this time they turned into Fabricated-Hyperbole or something just as uncertain. By this time they could no longer lay a case of eggs but had only one lone baby that needed warm milk. There are only a few people who know the particulars of what happened next, but as nearly as I can find out, there was a shortage of phosphorus or protein in the diet and two of these Hypothetical-Metaphors GOT AWAY FROM EVOLUTION and went right back to the sea to live very happy as backsliders. Of course they needed a fish tail again and evolution forgave the runaways and gave them a fish tail again in the place where their other tail had been, but somehow the thing slipped and the new fish tail was put on wrong so that it extends East and West instead of North and South.

There is a sad chapter left out of the story by the explainers.

All the millions of its kind that did not go back to the sea. DIED.

Every kind of brute their ancestors ever had been, DIED.

Not one intermediate form left; only the quitters lived. After evolution had worked for millions of years to get their ancestors out of the water so they could survive, then go back to the water and survive, when the ones that stayed with evolution all died; that makes it embarrassing for the explainers. They might write a book entitled "Why Whales Leave Home." As it is, they call the whale an "aberrant" form or a "degenerate."

BACKSLIDERS

The whale is the biggest backslider for which they offer apology, but by no means an isolated case. Common people who have heard only the evolution side of evolution, will be surprised to learn that of creatures big enough to be seen, most of them are classed as "DEGENERATES." (1)

They don't like me to tell this.

Nearly all parasites, as lice, ticks, mites, scale, and the

multitude of internal "boarders" are classified by evolutionists as "degenerate." By "degenerate," they mean they have left some "higher" level. There are three well known parasites that live on a hen and many more trouble-makers inside. Even fish have lice and other parasites. Some parasites have parasites.

This is a good place to stop and think.

If evolution has done anything, the most of its work has been to make "degenerates."

I don't blame the little one celled fellows for refusing to go on a pilgrimage. Do you?

Now when you tabulate the results of evolution according to their own claims, this is what you get.

- (1) Most of the living creatures remain one-cell.
- (2) Transitional forms are nearly all dead.
- (3) Many of the "higher" forms ended in extinction.
- (4) Of those that went with evolution and escaped extinction, most of them are degenerate.
- (5) The forms from which the "degenerates" degenerated are all dead.
- (6) All mammal forms are losing some of their structures.
- (7) Man, the shining example of what evolution can do, is losing 180 structures and getting no new ones in their stead.

After such a showing, they would like to commence on the Bible.

SEX SELECTION

Evoluters are a little shy about this "sex selection" process. Many of them have abandoned it. We could forgive them if they would admit that the facts they cannot use, weigh on the side of creation.

The theory presumes that birds and bugs and butterflies have color marks and designs because for millions of years, the females selected for mates those suitors that came nearest to their IDEAL.

It sounds as convincing as a college yell.

WHERE WOULD THE LADY BIRD OR BUG OR BUTTERFLY GET THE IDEAL?

If you can imagine these creatures getting an exquisite taste from nowhere, how could it happen that all the birds or bugs or butterflies of a kind, would AGREE on exactly the same colors in the same place of the design and stick to it for a million years?

Of all creatures, women have the best taste, yet if seven women were made a committee to select a design for an ideal man, in the end, they would submit seven designs. Yet we are asked to believe that all the females of any particular species agreed exactly on a design and refused to have mates that did not try to meet the plans and specifications.

How would that explain the markings of young birds (when different from parents), or caterpillars that are wholly different from papa and mama, or the golden trimmings of the pupa? How would it explain the marvelous beauty of creatures that are blind, as revealed or amplified by the microscope?

These questions might be multiplied and made to include the song of birds and the bray of donkeys, but what is the use? The stubborn facts are that most matings are determined by combat or happen-so. Common sense must be away on a vacation, if a man who knows ducks and their fondness for mud, can believe that mummy duck is concerned about the curl on the tail of her drake.

SIMILARITY IN ANATOMY

The fact that man is much like some animals in physical structure, is urged as a proof that he must have descended from the same ancestor. This argument is absolutely unanswerable, if you are sure that God could use the same general pattern in making creatures to meet the same physical environment, and you are sure that man has not changed since he first appeared. Are you sure? (Is. 55:9.)

Man has four limbs; so has an ape. What of it? must God have a different BEST for every creature? I am willing to surrender right now, if someone who knows how God could not do as he thinks he did, will come forward and tell us how God could have made millions of forms and had them all so different that men with highly evolved brains would accept his statement of creation.

Vernon Kellogg (evolutionist), in describing "undoubtedly the lowest of all mammal forms," tells of certain animals that "deposit a single egg in an external pouch, and there it hatches." Why call it the "lowest form"? If life began in the amoeba for all of us, then evolution has had just as long to work on the pedigree of this beast as on mine. In what way

have the animals that went higher gained any advantage? According to the contradictory program of evolution-ism, the "earlier" and "lower" forms of life laid anywhere from a hundred to ten million eggs, and as life went "UP" the ladder there were fewer and fewer babies. According to program, this one-egg mammal must be **next to the very top**. Evolution can go no higher than to take its favorites to where they refuse to have any babies.

How did this creature come to limit itself to one? would that help the family survive? How did it originate that egg pocket? If it happened in one generation, it was CREATION. If it took many generations, then it developed while it could not be used and this neither in accord with evolution nor with nature as we know it.

Did the animal evolve a pocket incubator by trying for a thousand generations to find a place to put its egg or did it hit upon the plan of laying an egg because it had a pocket with nothing to put in it? Perhaps it held the egg up against the place where a pocket was desired till the pocket "came out to meet the need."

If you believe this, you can qualify as a "Mother Goose" enthusiast.

If this creature is an ancient "transitional form," a kind of a station where the creatures change cars why did the "higher" creatures get rid of this portable hatchery? Isn't it the handiest baby arrangement on earth? Do evoluters predict that other "lower" forms will get this arrangement before they need it and lose it while they are using it?

PERFECT BALANCE

There must be a BEST plan for God to follow in making a creature to fit particular habits, purposes, climates, foods, and resist foes. Now it follows that God must make some other creature that meets nearly the same conditions, on nearly the same pattern, if he does his best. The variation in equipment must keep up with the variation in conditions and the advantages and handicaps must preserve a balance, no more, no less than enough to keep one from driving others out.

BEAUTY AND ODDITY

In addition to variation for the sake of balance, God has

added beauty and oddity. If his sole purpose in doing this was to disprove evolution, **he has done it well.** Evolution will be a long time explaining the "identification" marks and manners of all life.

WHAT SIMILARITY PROVES

Meat platters, soup plates, dinner plates, pie plates, and saucers have a similarity. Now suppose we dig in the pottery yard and find broken saucers below broken meat platters, does that prove that they fed saucers into one end of a machine and took platters out at the other end? Is the little dish a many-times-grandmother to the big one. Have the cream pitcher and sugar bowl descended from a marble? On the contrary, it indicates that one maker made each one for a different purpose—of the same clay. It is hardly consistent for our evolve tutors to insist that an amoeba would make us alike and a God could not.

EVOLUTION BY FITS AND STARTS

If all forms of life have developed from the amoeba, there ought to be a continuous upward flow, showing creatures in every stage of evolution getting ready to be what they are not. If there are forms a million years apart, why not a thousand or a hundred years apart? To avoid this fair inference, they say the intermediate forms are extinct. Who killed them and forbade others coming on? As a matter of fact, there is not one living creature between amoeba and man that they are sure is the form through which our evolution passed. They can only agree that our ancestors were some sort of marsupials, reptiles, amphibians, fish, etc. Unless evolution goes by jerks, there ought to be **SOMETHING A LITTLE MORE AND SOMETHING A LITTLE LESS THAN EVERY FORM WE HAVE AND THE STREAM OUGHT TO KEEP COMING.** In order to bridge the mighty chasm between man and reptiles, they assume that our distant ancestors were something like a kangaroo or opossum. Why are there no creatures 10 per cent, 20 per cent and 30 per cent more than opossum and less than opossum? Where evidence is most needed, it is always missing. They are very free to tell you what animals and birds have been, but are quite too shy and modest to tell you what any animal will become.

If humming birds and eagles have evolved from reptiles, then there ought to be some forms 99 per cent reptile and one per cent bird, others 98—2 per cent, 97—3 per cent, on up to 1 per cent reptile and 99 per cent bird. Among all the reptiles, will some expert pick out any kind of reptile that will turn into any kind of bird? If anyone will undertake the job, I will gladly print his forecast in the next edition.

It is necessary to assume that evolution has gone forward in waves killing off all between the waves, ending some waves in total extinction, letting most of the waves degenerate, and now the waves have stopped coming and man is losing 180 conveniences he formerly had.

THEY ASSUME A GULF OF HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF YEARS AND BRIDGE IT WITH OBITUARIES.

Why must they assume so much?

I think I know.

It is for the same reason that when a beautiful heiress gets shipwrecked, she selects a tropical island where a wonderful young hero has been marooned by cruel plotters. It enables him to rescue her from sharks while the sailors all drown. It affords them a chance to kill savages and wild beast and discover a gold mine and be rescued soon after her wicked uncle dies. How else could they marry at \$1.50 per copy?

BONES AND STONES

To support the assumption that connecting links are extinct, they appeal to fossils. In this field they have a double advantage. (a) Not one in a hundred is able to examine the evidence, much less understand it.



(b) Once they find a bone, they can name it what they please, date it when they please, add as much ink or plaster of paris as they please, and who can hinder them? Newspapers are ready to feature any guess or any picture they can fabricate.

Here are two samples of how it is done.

The *Pithecanthropus Erectus* is the name of a bone and what ink does with it. (If you can't pronounce it, it must be scientific.) The shaded portion represents a piece of skull bone. The outline shows how they think the former owner ought to have looked to fit the theory. To know that a bone had a flat nose and wore a No. 24 collar, is SUPER-science. It apes divinity. They make no report as to whether the gentleman had freckles. Perhaps they do not know.

On the following page is another job of "restoring." Two bones and two teeth are called "The Sussex Man." It is adapted and drawn to scale from a magazine article entitled "SCIENCE." The face and head are how he "might have looked." If you will cut out a piece of paper exactly like the bones and lay it over the savage face, you will see that to make the "Sussex man" fit the theory of evolution, his head is made too small for the skull bone and his face much too long for the jaw bone.

You can feed this sort of "science" to anyone who is as willing and trusting as a young robin when he gets his dinner.

So far as is certainly known, life appeared on earth in substantially the order that is given in Genesis. All the experts seem to agree that there are great gaps in the records of the rocks and that so far as these records go, some forms appeared abruptly. If there were intermediate forms, they have been lost in the gaps. Many of the claims of great geologists and paleontologists are disputed by others equally great. The author is not competent to pass upon these claims. We may all of us use common sense and to such it will be apparent that to prove one animal lived before another, does not prove one descended from the other. If the bones of a Shetland pony are found beneath the bones of a draft horse, there is yet room for doubt that the Shetland was the ancestor. No matter where you find the bones, the lap dog is not the father of the Great Dane.

If someone digs us out 10,000 years hence, they may find tomato cans under automobiles. They may show that tomato cans preceded automobiles. Even if they prove that no nation ever produced automobiles till after eating tomatoes, it will not prove that tomatoes caused automobiles, much less that automobiles evolved from cans, with an intermediate wheelbarrow missing.



In order to disprove creation, the rocks must show that not all creatures were brought forth "after their kind," as God says they were and as they certainly are now. They will never do that.

While there is a matter of 800,000,000 years difference in the claims of the experts, no one need to get uneasy for fear the friends of the Bible will be fighting science. So long as nine-tenths of the vast periods they claim, are in dispute, some of us will continue to put quotation marks around the "science" that seeks to replace revelation with opinions.

THE ARGUMENT FROM UNBORN LIFE

The author regrets that he cannot here contribute something to the exposure of the colossal hoax called "The Recapitulation Theory," but this book is written for young as well as old and though propagandist have not spared to stab the trusting faith of childhood, the arguments from unborn life must wait for another book or reach you in the books published by others.

COMPROMISES

There are so many shades and blends of evolution as there are evolvers who wish to be ORIGINAL. It naturally follows that a "science" that takes any hat for a home, will flirt with religion, and some are so impressed with the word "science" that they would have the religion of Christ tag around after it.



Evolution has a creed that its shamed devotees try to hide with borrowed morals. SELFISHNESS WINS. GRATIFY EVERY APPETITE. It sounds like a devil's "AMEN." No need to argue this, any cat fight will prove it. Tennyson said:

"Man trusted God was love indeed,
And love Creation's final law;
Tho' nature, red in tooth and claw
With raven, shrieked against his creed."

No explanation or apology that denies the displeasure of God that "the earth is filled with violence," (Gen. 6:13) can serve to cloak dripping jaws with the gentleness of Christ. Life has gone wrong; not evolved. If you can make some nice adjustment between my devil and your God that lifts your soul, be sure "flaming youth" will not. Too many boys who are told their ancestry is 99 per cent brute are making a 50 per cent average.



This logic will give loose rein to youth for a plunge, but its only answer to the prayer of age and frailty is: DIE AND GET OUT OF THE WAY.

If evolution has brought us through a million ages of

swamp and jungle by **saving the best killers** and has given us a sense of guilt and the certainty of death and yawning eternity, that the brutes never had, what can it offer to quiet our dread and satisfy our longing?

Do you think evolution **HAS ONE LAW FOR THE TIGER AND ANOTHER FOR YOU?**

When the shadows deepen, evolution has nothing for **YOU** but **DEATH**.

Cool your fever with that handful of ice.

If you think evolution was God's method, it heard no prayer and showed no mercy. When it is done with you and your little play spell is ended, will you grope in the gloom for eternal life utterly foreign to the system? How can a man who thinks he hangs his temporary life on a brute succession drawn out for a half billion years and then suppose that some shadow of himself will ride forth from his dead body on a dying gasp, to see without eyes, hear without ears and think without a brain?

In 20 seconds—eternal life!

I do not object to any evolutionist going to heaven if evolution will leave him a heaven to go to and give him anything to go there with. If you deny the miracle of creation, what can evolution do with a corpse?

Eternal farewells, falling tears, fading flowers, silence, night!

I know there are some who believe it pleased God to breed selfishness and brutishness into man for hundreds of millions of years and then offer him heaven if he can get it out some way. Others presume that God made man by adding a part of himself to an ape's body, but what a mess they got themselves into! An ape madonna! Since the Bible says Adam was "the son of God," this is well—you name it. It presumes that evolution has been working some 6,000 years to improve a "son of God" made "in his image." If this supposed **BLEND** fell, which part of the partnership takes blame?

I have no quarrel with real or hope-so science when it knows its place. God gave man a commission to "subdue" the earth and I rejoice that science can harness the untamed forces, but it must not censor revelation nor impose its hobbles on

God. A science that claims to have evolved from lizards and lemurs ought to be more modest.



I want a religion older than I am, a God that neither man nor archangel can make his plans or do his thinking for him. The prophet cried, "Thus saith Jehovah"; Jesus said, "I spake not from myself"; of the Holy Spirit he said, "He shall not speak from himself." Who are these men so eager to amend the "faith once for all delivered" with a man-made message from a brain that they admit is only seven evolutionary epochs ahead of a carp?

A PARTING SHOT

Is it the truth or a lie that evolution without the trimmings that have been added to cover up its shame is really this?

TAKE WHAT YOU WANT, WHEN YOU WANT IT,
ANYWHERE YOU FIND IT, ANY WAY YOU CAN GET IT.

THE MODERN MISUSE OF THE BIBLE

There are three types of flaw-picking critics of the Bible.

- (1) The Bible is fallible; I am not! Let me guide you.
- (2) The Bible is fallible; so am I! Let me guide you.
- (3) The Bible is fallible or I am! Let me guide you.

If you know any Bible rival who claims some other classification, let me know.

Wonderful self-reliance. A man who admits that his brain is less than EIGHT INCHES FROM HIS GILL SLITS appoints himself a censor of the Eternal Word. What will they not do when they evolve once more?

LIGHT OR SATELLITE

No church can be the "Light of the World" (Matt. 5: 14), if it asks the World what it may believe. The tagging church "rethinks" its doctrines to keep up with the parade. Certainly it is not unhitched from the World. James 4: 4.



THE
**PILGRIM'S
PROGRESS**
OF
MODERNISM

PURDLE TO PARADISE

BY THE
AUTHOR
OF
**"JOCKO-HOMO
HEAVENBOUND"**